R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 085 24

ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND EFFECTIVE WORKING RELATIONSHIPS.

BY- OTTO, HENRY J. VELDMAN, DONALD J.
TEXAS UNIV., AUSTIN

REPORT NUMBER CRF-S-350 PUB DATE 66
REPORT NUMBER BR-5-8126
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$2.32 58P.

DESCRIPTORS- SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION, *PRINCIPALS, *PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS, *ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS, COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS, *ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE, *TEACHER ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIP, DECISION MAKING, ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE, MCLEOD CONTROL STRUCTURE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE, AUSTIN

THE CONTROL STRUCTURE IN PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS WAS RELATED TO THE DIMENSIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE BY INVESTIGATING THE RELATIONSHIPS OF ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS' AND TEACHERS' SCORES ON TWO MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS. THE HALPIN-CROFT ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE AND THE MCLEOD CONTROL STRUCTURE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE WERE ADMINISTERED TO 38 PRINCIPALS AND 684 TEACHERS. THE LATTER TEST CONTAINED 80 PROBLEM SITUATIONS DISTRIBUTED EQUALLY INTO THE FOUR FUNCTIONAL AREAS OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM, DEVELOPING PERSONNEL, MANAGING THE SCHOOL, AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS. IT WAS FOUND THAT THERE WERE SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN AND AMONG THE PRINCIPALS' ALLOCATIONS OF SCORES ON BOTH TESTS AND THE TEACHERS' ALLOCATIONS OF SCORES ON BOTH TESTS. THE GENERAL CONCLUSION, HOWEVER, WAS THAT PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS DO NOT USE A COMMON FRAME OR REFERENCE FOR VIEWING THEIR RELATIONSHIPS TO EACH OTHER, AND THEY SEE DECISION MAKING AND SCHOOL CLIMATE FROM DISSIMILAR VANTAGE POINTS. (GD)

ED011085

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND EFFECTIVE WORKING RELATIONSHIPS

Cooperative Research Project S-350
Bureau Number 5-8126-2-12-1

by

Henry J. Otto, Principal Investigator
and
Donald J. Veldman
The University of Texas
Austin, Texas

June 15, 1965 to May 31, 1966

The research reported herewith was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Table of Contents

Topic	Page
1. Problem	1
2. Rationale and Hypotheses	3
3. General Information Data	6
4. Testing the Hypotheses	20
5. Concluding Observations.	33
6. Bibliography	41
7. Appendix A	42
8. Vignette Instrument II	45

List of Tables

		Page
1.	Vignette Decision Scores: School System A . . .	7
2.	Vignette Influence Scores: School System A . .	8
3.	Correlations between Decision Scores and Influence Scores	9
4.	Correlations between Teachers' Mean Self-Assigned Decision Scores and Principals' Decision Scores Assigned to Teachers; and between Teachers' Mean Self-Assigned Influence Scores and Principals' Influence Scores Assigned to Teachers	15
5.	Correlations between Principals Self-Assigned Decision Scores and Teachers' Mean Decision Scores Assigned to Principals; and between Principals' Self-Assigned Influence Scores and Teachers' Mean Influence Scores Assigned to Principals	16
6.	Canonical Analysis: Principals' vs. Teachers' Decision Allocation	17
7.	Canonical Analysis: Principals' vs. Teachers' OCDQ Scores	19
8.	Correlations between Principals' Self-Assigned Decision Scores and Principals' OCDQ Scores . .	25
9.	Correlations between Principals' Decision Scores Assigned to Teachers and Principals' OCDQ Scores	26
10.	Canonical Analysis: Principal OCDQ vs. Principal Decision Allocation	28
11.	Correlations between Teachers' Self-Assigned Decision Scores and Teachers' OCDQ Scores . . .	30

12. Correlations between Teachers' Decision Scores Assigned to Principals and Teachers' OCDQ Scores 31

13. Canonical Analysis: Teacher OCDQ vs. Teacher Decision Allocation 32

Problem

The object of the study reported herewith was to relate the control structure in public school systems as perceived by elementary school principals and teachers in four types of school problem areas to the dimensions of the organizational climate of the schools as perceived by principals and teachers. The project included 38 elementary schools with 698 teachers in six school systems of different size in Texas. Usable responses were obtained from 38 principals and 684 teachers. Two instruments were administered to all teachers and the principal in each of the 38 schools. The instruments were the Halpin-Croft Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (hereafter called OCDQ)[3] and the McLeod Control Structure Description Questionnaire.[6] The latter, also called the Vignette Instrument, contained 80 problem situations distributed equally into four functional areas as follows:

Functions	No. of items
1. Educational Program	20
2. Developing personnel	20
3. Managing the school	20
4. Community relations	20
Total	80

The Vignette Instrument (a copy of which is appended to this report) directed each person to respond twice to each item. The response sheet contained seven columns labeled Teacher(s), Principal(s), Cur. Dir.(s), Supervisor(s), Business Manager, Superintendent, and School Board. The respondent's first task was to place an x in the column representing the person (position) in the organization who the respondent thought made the final decision on each item. The second task was to place a value of 1 to 5 under the name or names of persons who influenced the decision; the total influence values so allocated could never exceed 5 but could be distributed among as many as 5 different persons or could all be assigned to the final decision-maker if he arrived at the decision by himself without influence from anyone else. The number of x's assigned to a person provided the decision score (size of the decision domain) and the sum of the influence values assigned to a person provided his influence score. The OCDQ was scored in accordance with directions provided by Halpin and Croft; all raw scores were converted to standard scores with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10 using statistics published by Halpin and Croft.

The number of elementary school teachers in the six school systems ranged from 56 to 389. In the three largest school systems only six schools were included in the study but these were chosen so that they ranged from the smallest to the largest school in each system.

Rationale and Hypotheses

In this study control structure was defined as the organization for decision-making. In the formal organization role assignments (usually identified by position titles and sometimes accompanied by job descriptions) invariably include the authority to make decisions on certain matters. Fogarty and Gregg[2] used the phrase "locus of decision points" to identify who in the school system was primarily responsible for making a particular decision. The formal structure for decision-making may be highly centralized or highly decentralized; in the latter case it may be said to be diffuse, with many types of decision made by persons at different levels in the scalar chain of command. A school system in which the structure for decision-making is diffuse elementary school principals and teachers may have a large decision domain.

It was assumed that principals and teachers were professionals and as a result would enjoy a high degree of autonomy in their work, would be happy with a large decision and influence domain, and that those who assigned themselves high decision and influence scores would manifest a sense of personal satisfaction and accomplishment in their work and hence would rate organizational climate as high in esprit, thrust, and consideration and low in disengagement, hindrance, and aloofness. For teachers this assumption would be particularly true with reference to the educational program (Blau and Scott[1], pp. 61-68 and 209). Peabody[7], in studying the types of authority relations in a welfare organization, a police department, and a public elementary school found the most striking contrast between these three public service agencies to be the relative importance attached to authority of professional competence in the elementary school.

A complicating factor in using decision domain alone as an index against which to relate views of organizational climate is the fact that decision point and influence on the decision do not always agree. A teacher may rate his own professional autonomy as

high if the teacher knows that his views are the determining factor even though the final decision is made by the principal or someone even higher up in the administrative hierarchy. This possibility was given strong support in Kimbrough's[4] report of decision-making in individual schools.

The following hypotheses were formulated and tested:

Hypotheses No. 1. There are significant relationships between principals' allocation of decision scores and principals' scores in the eight dimensions of O C D Q.

Hypotheses No. 2. There are significant relationships between teachers' allocation of decision scores and teachers' scores in the eight dimensions of O C D Q.

The preceding hypotheses are stated in general terms and ignore the fact that teachers as well as principals could assign decision and influence scores to supervisors, curriculum directors, superintendent, business manager, and school board. The present study focused specifically upon relationships in elementary schools; hence the decision and influence assignments

to levels above the principal are treated only incidentally in the discussion of the findings. The phraseology of the hypotheses also overlooks the fact that the relationships might differ for the four functional areas; these, too, will be treated in the discussion of the findings.[a]

General Information Data

To assist the reader in understanding more easily the data presented later in testing the hypotheses, certain general information is presented in this section. Tables 1 and 2 illustrate (for School System A) the way in which teachers and principals distributed the decision and influence scores. Decision point and influence on the decision seem to go together (Table 3). If you wish to know who exerts the greatest influence on the decision, find out who makes the final decision.

The fact that decision point and influence seem to go together does not necessarily mean that

---

a. Donald J. Veldman directed the treatment of data, wrote the computer programs, and assisted in the interpretation of data. The formulas and statistical tables used may be found in Robert K. Young and Donald J. Veldman. Introductory Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1965, and in Donald J. Veldman Fortran Programing for the Behavioral Sciences, Holt, Rinehart & Winston (in press).

TABLE I
Vignette Decision Scores
School System A

Scores Assigned to	Functional Areas: Educational Program	Development of Personnel	Managing the School	Community Relations	Total
1. Teachers					
a. By Principals	7.800	2.000	1.800	1.200	12.800
b. By Teachers	7.472	1.885	1.937	2.113	13.407
2. Principals					
a. By Principals	7.400	7.200	13.000	5.600	33.200
b. By teachers	7.357	7.842	12.900	5.425	33.523
3. Curriculum Direc.					
a. By Principals	2.600	1.600	1.000	1.400	6.600
b. By Teachers	3.063	1.105	.790	.910	5.868
4. Supervisors					
a. By Principals	.400	0.000	.600	0.000	1.000
b. By Teachers	.247	.260	.548	.087	1.142
5. Supt. & Busi. Mgr.					
a. By Principals	1.800	8.200	3.200	9.000	22.200
b. By Teachers	1.545	7.415	2.635	6.495	18.090
6. School Board					
a. By Principals	0.000	1.000	.400	2.800	4.200
b. By Teachers	.317	1.493	1.190	4.970	7.970

[a]Principals' decision scores used in this table are the average scores for principals in the school system. Teachers' decision scores were computed as follows: a mean was computed for teachers in each school and then these means were averaged over schools.

TABLE 2
Vignette Influence Scores
School System A

Scores Assigned to	Functional Areas: Educational Program	Development of Personnel	Managing the School	Community Relations	Total
1. Teachers					
a. By Principals	44.200	13.400	15.600	14.600	87.800
b. By Teachers	44.337	12.537	13.943	15.023	85.840
2. Principals					
a. By Principals	38.400	40.800	60.600	31.600	171.400
b. By Teachers	35.357	43.955	61.797	31.990	173.098
3. Curriculum Direc.					
a. By Principals	10.800	9.400	4.600	4.600	29.400
b. By Teachers	11.725	6.793	4.297	6.407	29.222
4. Supervisors					
a. By Principals	3.800	4.000	4.600	3.000	15.400
b. By Teachers	1.453	2.623	2.880	1.158	8.115
5. Supt. & Busi. Mgr.					
a. By Principals	2.600	31.400	13.600	35.200	82.800
b. By Teachers	6.060	29.683	13.597	29.823	79.163
6. School Board					
a. By Principals	.200	1.000	1.000	11.000	13.200
b. By Teachers	1.068	4.408	3.487	15.598	24.562

[a]Principals' influence scores used in this table are the average scores for principals in the school system. Teachers' influence scores were computed as follows: a mean was computed for teachers in each school and then these means were averaged over schools.

TABLE 3

Correlations between Decision Scores and Influence Scores[a]

Functional Area	Principal Source		Teacher Source	
	Teacher Object	Principal Object	Teacher Object	Principal Object
1. Educational Program	.56	.61	.78	.86
2. Development of Personnel	.49	.55	.79	.87
3. Managing the School	.43	.82	.68	.88
4. Community Relations	.42	.79	.58	.86
5. Total	.48	.87	.71	.87

[a]All correlations in this table are significant at the 1 percent level.

teachers and principals agree on the distribution of these assignments within the four functional areas. To ascertain what differences, if any, existed, analysis of variance tests* were applied to the relationships between principal and teacher allocation of these scores. The results of these analyses are summarized below.

Decision Allocation to Teachers

(1) Educational Program: no significant effects

(2) Personnel Development: A significant systems effect (p. = .0042) One system was very much below the other 5 in allocation by both principals and teachers in its 11 schools.

(3) Managing the School: no significant effects

---

* A technical description of the analysis of variance design used to study each of the 28 variables listed here and in a later section of this report may be found in Appendix A. In brief, the "sources" effect refers to teacher-principal differences, the "systems" effect refers to differences among the 6 school systems concerned, and the "interaction" effect indicates the degree to which teacher-principal differences vary across the six school systems. The "sources" effect is of primary interest in this report. "p" coefficients are the probabilities that the observed differences were due only to chance.

(4) Community Relations: a significant sources effect (p = .0001) Principals allocated less power to teachers than the teachers did to themselves in this area.

(5) Total of all 4 Areas: A significant sources effect (p = .0132) Principals allocate less decision-making power to teachers than the teachers allocate to themselves.

Decision Allocation to Principals

(1) Educational Program: A significant sources effect (p = .0205) Principals allocate more power to themselves than teachers allocate to them.

A significant systems effect (p = .0516): Substantial differences exist among the 6 systems in amount of power allocated to principals.

(2) Development of Personnel: A significant systems effect (p = .0050): Systems vary considerably in amount of power allocated to principals.

(3) Managing the School: A significant systems effect (p = .0003) Systems vary considerably in amount of power allocated to principal.

A significant interaction effect (p = .0216): 2 of the 6 systems showed lower allocation by principals than by teachers.

(4) Community Relations: A significant sources effect (p = .0083) Teachers allocated more power to the principal than he did to himself in most of the 38 schools.

(5) Total of all 4 Areas: A significant systems effect (p = .0008) A considerable degree of variation was found among school systems in allocation of power to principals.

Influence Attributed to Teachers

(1) Educational Program: systems were significantly different from one another (p = .00005)

(2) Development of Personnel: systems were significantly different from one another (p = .0266)

(3) Managing the School: no significant effects

(4) Community Relations: no significant effects

(5) Total of all 4 Areas: systems were significantly different in the influence attributed to teachers (p = .0038)

Influence Attributed to Principals

(1) Educational Program: systems were significantly different generally ($p = .0361$), and principals attributed more influence to themselves than their teachers did to them ($p = .0125$)

(2) Development of Personnel: systems were significantly different ($p = .0001$)

(3) Managing the School: systems were significantly different in general ($p = .0017$) and a significant interaction ($p = .0481$) indicated that 2 of the 6 systems had higher averages by principals than by teachers.

(4) Community Relations: systems were significantly different ($p = .0038$). Teachers attributed more influence to the principals than they did to themselves ($p = .0252$), and a significant interaction ($p = .0094$) was due to 2 of the 6 systems where principals gave themselves more influence than did their teachers.

(5) Total of all 4 Areas: Systems were significantly different in attribution of influence to principals ($p = .00005$).

The extent to which teachers and principals agree on the allocation of decision and influence scores to each other was tested in two ways. Tables 4 and 5 contain Product Moment correlations. The major disagreements appear to arise in connection with development of personnel and in decision scores in the area of community relations (Table 4). The degree of agreement is tenuous in regard to the principal's role in the educational program as perceived by the two groups (Table 5). The second treatment of the data was a canonical analysis of the relationships between principals' and teachers' decision score allocation (Table 6). The relationship between principals' and teachers' allocations of decision-making may be adequately summarized with one composite dimension. The common pattern is for principals to see themselves involved in Development of Personnel and Managing the School and their teachers as concerned with Development of Personnel and the Educational Program. The teachers, however, see themselves as involved only with the Educational Program and their principals as concerned with this even more strongly, along with Development of Personnel.

TABLE 4

Correlations between Teachers' Mean Self-Assigned Decision Scores and Principals' Decision Scores Assigned to Teachers; and between Teachers' Mean Influence Scores Assigned to Themselves and Principals' Influence Scores Assigned to Teachers

Functional Areas	Decision Scores	Influence Scores
1. Educational Program	.42[a]	.54[a]
2. Development of Personnel	.19	.12
3. Managing the School	.33	.39
4. Community Relations	.26	.30
5. Total	.40	.40

[a]Correlations below .30 are not significant; those between .30 and .39 are significant at the 5 percent level; those over .39 are significant at the 1 percent level.

TABLE 5

Correlations between Principals' Self-assigned Decision Scores and Teachers' Mean Decision Scores Assigned to Principal; and between Principals' Self-assigned Influence Scores and Teachers' Mean Influence Scores Assigned to Principals

Functional Areas	Decision Scores	Influence Scores
1. Educational Program	.35[a]	.23[a]
2. Development of Personnel	.35	.51
3. Managing the School	.36	.55
4. Community Relations	.35	.42
5. Total	.45	.55

[a]Correlations below .30 are not significant; those between .30 and .39 are significant at the 5 percent level; those over .39 are significant at the 1 percent level.

TABLE 6

Canonical Analysis: Principals' vs.
Teachers' Decision Allocation

Area	P-T Correlation	Correlations with Canonical Variable P-C	T-C
Teacher Decision			
Educ. Program	.42**	.30	.38
Dev. Personnel	.19	.56	.08
Manage School	.33*	-.01	-.08
Comm. Relat.	.26	-.04	-.01
Principal Decision			
Educ. Program	.35*	.26	.59
Dev. Personnel	.35*	.46	.36
Manage School	.36*	.37	.28
Comm. Relat.	.35*	.12	.05

One significant canonical function ($\chi^2 = 49.75$, df = 15, p = .0001) canonical r = .90

There is considerable disagreement between teachers and principals regarding most of the measured aspects of the organizational climates of their schools (Table 7), but one underlying consistency did emerge from the canonical analysis. The relationship of principals' to teachers' OCDQ descriptions of their school climates may be summarized adequately with one composite dimension. From the principals' viewpoint climate is primarily a function of Esprit and Production Emphasis, while the teachers see climate as a function of Esprit and (non) Aloofness.

Analyses of variance* in which principals' OCDQ scores, teachers' OCDQ scores, and school systems were interrelated produced the following results:

Climate Description

(1) Disengagement: no significant effects

(2) Hindrance: no significant effects

(3) Esprit: a significant interaction effect ($p = .0034$): In 1 of the 6 school systems, the principals reported a lower level of esprit than did the teachers.

---

* See Appendix A for a technical description of the design used.

TABLE 7

Canonical Analysis: Principals' vs. Teachers' OCDQ Scores

Scale	P-T Correlation	Correlations with Canonical Variable P-C	T-C
Disengagement	.16	.00	.04
Hindrance	.35*	.02	-.10
Esprit	.58**	.64	.44
Intimacy	.06	.38	.08
Aloofness	.02	.10	-.68
Prod. Emphasis	.18	.55	.18
Thrust	.39*	.30	.10
Consideration	.03	-.24	-.20

One significant canonical function ($x^2 = 25.6$, df = 15, p = .04) canonical r = .76

(4) Intimacy: a significant interaction effect ($p = .0018$): In 1 of the 6 school systems, the principals reported a lower level of intimacy than did the teachers. A significant sources effect ($p = .0001$): principals reported a higher level of intimacy than did teachers.

(5) Aloofness: no significant effects

(6) Production Emphasis: a significant interaction effect ($p = .0088$): This was reported higher by principals than by teachers in 3 of the 6 school systems.

(7) Thrust: a significant interaction effect ($p = .0410$): In 2 systems the principals and teachers saw it as equal, but the other 4 systems had higher scores by teachers than by principals. A significant sources effect ($p = .0025$): teachers generally saw this as higher than did their principals.

(8) Consideration: no significant differences

Testing the Hypotheses

To assist the reader in following the method used in testing the hypotheses we have reproduced the descriptions of the eight dimensions of organizational climate as stated by Halpin and Croft.

The Eight Dimensions of the OCDQ

Teacher's Behavior

1. Disengagement refers to the teachers' tendency to be "not with it." This dimension describes a group which is "going through the motions," a group that is "not in gear" with respect to the task at hand. It corresponds to the more general concept of anomie as first described by Durkheim.[a] In short, this subtest focusses upon the teachers' behavior in a task-oriented situation.

2. Hindrance refers to the teachers' feeling that the principal burdens them with routine duties, committee demands, and other requirements which the teachers construe as unnecessary busy-work. The teachers perceive that the principal is hindering rather than facilitating their work.

---

a. Emile Durkheim, Le Suicide (Paris: Librarie Felix Alcan, 1930), p. 277. Anomie describes a planlessness in living, a method of living which defeats itself because achievement has no longer any criterion of value; happiness always lies beyond any present achievement. Defeat takes the form of ultimate disillusion -- a disgust with the futility of endless pursuit.

3. Esprit refers to "morale." The teachers feel that their social needs are being satisfied, and that they are, at the same time, enjoying a sense of accomplishment in their job.
4. Intimacy refers to the teachers' enjoyment of friendly social relations with each other. This dimension describes a social-needs satisfaction which is not necessarily associated with task-accomplishment.

Principal's Behavior

5. Aloofness refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized as formal and impersonal. He "goes by the book" and prefers to be guided by rules and policies rather than to deal with the teachers in an informal, face-to-face situation. His behavior, in brief, is universalistic rather than particularistic; nomothetic rather than idiosyncratic. To maintain this style, he keeps himself - at least, "emotionally" at a distance from his staff.
6. Production Emphasis refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by close supervision of the staff. He is highly directive,

and plays the role of a "straw boss." His communication tends to go in only one direction, and he is not sensitive to feedback from the staff.

7. Thrust refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by his evident effort in trying to "move the organization." "Thrust" behavior is marked not by close supervision, but by the principal's attempt to motivate the teachers through the example which he personally sets. Apparently, because he does not ask the teachers to give of themselves any more than he willingly gives of himself, his behavior, though starkly task-oriented, is nonetheless viewed favorably by the teachers.

8. Consideration refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by an inclination to treat the teachers "humanly," to try to do a little something extra for them in human terms.

The two hypotheses were tested by application of two complementary statistical procedures, product-moment correlation and canonical analysis, which extracts composite summary dimensions from the basic intercorrelations of two sets of variables.

As indicated in Tables 4, 5, and 6, and particularly in Table 7, substantial disagreement appeared between principals and the teachers in their schools with regard to the appropriate allocation of decision-making power and influence and with regard to most of the dimensions of organizational climate in the 38 schools concerned. For this reason, relationships between climate descriptions and decision-influence allocation were examined only from the principals' point of view and the teachers' point of view separately. No attempts were made to relate principals' views of climate to teachers' decision-influcence scores or vice versa. Because of the strong correlations found between influence and decision scores, as indicated in Table 3, canonical correlation analyses were computed between climate (OCDQ) profiles and decision-profiles only.

All correlational questions were answered by computing coefficients from 38 principals' scores and/or 38 means of the scores obtained from teachers in the same schools.

Table 8 contains the correlations between principals' self-assigned decision scores and principals' OCDQ scores. Table 9 portrays the correlations between

TABLE 8

Correlations between Principals' Self-Assigned Decision Scores and Principals' OCDQ Scores

Functional Areas	Dimensions of Organizational Climate							
	D	H	E	I	A	P	T	C
Decision Scores	Principals' OCDQ Scores							
1. Educational Program....	.09	-.13	.16	.19	.47	.45	.42	.28
2. Development of Personnel	-.15	-.29	.23	.13	.04	.19	.21	-.26
3. Managing the School....	.11	-.11	.16	.25	.26	.28	.28	.09
4. Community Relations....	.13	-.26	.34	.24	.02	.30	.35	-.02
5. Total.....	.08	-.30	.34	.31	.33	.49	.50	.06

D - Disengagement
H - Hindrance
E - Esprit
I - Intimacy
A - Aloofness
P - Production Emphasis
T - Thrust
C - Consideration

Note: Correlations under .30 are not significant; those from .30 to .39 are significant at the 5 percent level; those over .39 are significant at the 1 percent level.

TABLE 9

Correlations between Principals' Decision Scores assigned to Teachers and Principals' OCDQ Scores

Functional Areas	Dimensions of Organizational Climate							
	D	H	E	I	A	P	T	C
Decision Scores	Principals' OCDQ Scores							
1. Educational Program	-.07	-.15	-.09	-.23	-.32	-.35	-.37	-.51
2. Development of Personnel	.08	.26	-.11	-.16	-.33	-.20	-.31	-.27
3. Managing the School	-.06	-.25	.18	.20	-.05	-.21	-.09	-.28
4. Community Relations	.03	-.05	.01	-.09	.02	-.19	-.17	-.36
5. Total	-.03	-.11	-.04	-.15	-.28	-.35	-.36	-.52

D - Disengagement
H - Hindrance
E - Esprit
I - Intimacy
A - Aloofness
P - Production Emphasis
T - Thrust
C - Consideration

Note: Correlations under .30 are not significant; those between 30 and .39 are significant at the 5 percent level; those over .39 are significant at the 1 percent level.

principals' decision scores assigned to teachers and principals' OCDQ scores. Table 10 contains the canonical analysis data in which principals' decision allocation to themselves and to their teachers are compared to the dimensions of climate description by these principals.

The relationships between principals' OCDQ profiles and their allocation of decisions may be summarized with two independent composite dimensions. The first dimension links a climate marked by high Esprit and low Hindrance with the principals' decision power in Community Relations and Development of Personnel and teachers' decision power in Managing the School. The second dimension links a climate marked by high Thrust, Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Consideration and Intimacy with principal's decision power over Educational Program at the expense of teachers, low teacher power in Development of Personnel, and strong principal control in managing the school. The first dimension seems to identify the decision structure of a high-esprit, low-hindrance climate while the second dimension describes the decision structure associated with a principal-dominated school.

TABLE 10

Canonical Analysis: Principal OCDQ vs.

Principal Decision Allocation

Canonical Function I (χ^2= 37.97, df = 15, p = .0013)
canonical r = 85.

OCDQ	Correlations with Canonical Variable		Decision Allocation	
Disengagement	.07	.32	Ed. Prog.	
Hindrance	-.48	.05	Dev. Pers.	To Teachers
Esprit	.48	.42	Man. Sch.	
Intimacy	.33	.25	Com. Rel.	
Aloofness	.07	.08	Ed. Prog.	
Prod.Emphasis	.25	.57	Dev. Pers.	To Principals
Thrust	.34	.27	Man. Sch.	
Consideration	-.39	.70	Comm. Rel.	

Canonical Function II (χ^2= 28.22, df = 13, p = .0092)
canonical r = .78

Disengagement	.09	-.87	Ed. Prog.	
Hindrance	-.09	-.57	Dev. Pers.	To Teachers
Esprit	.29	-.30	Man. Sch.	
Intimacy	.48	-.32	Comm. Rel.	
Aloofness	.61	.84	Ed. Prog.	
Prod. Emphasis	.54	.03	Dev. Pers.	To Principals
Thrust	.60	.49	Man. Sch.	
Consideration	.51	.17	Comm. Rel.	

Hypothesis No. 1 is therefore supported. The way in which principals perceive their own and their teachers' decision domain produces two distinct patterns in which the significant correlations in one pattern differ appreciably from the significant relationships in the other. The data for testing Hypothesis No. 2 are found in Tables 11, 12, and 13. In Table 11 there is only one significant relationship with Educational Program and two with Development of Personnel. Table 12 has only two significant relationships, both with Development of Personnel. Table 13 contains the canonical analysis of interrelationships. The relationship of teachers' OCDQ profiles to their allocation of decisions may be summarized with two independent composite dimensions. The first dimension links low Aloofness with principals' power over Development of Personnel. The second dimension is more complex, linking a climate marked by Hindrance, Aloofness, and Consideration with decision power of teachers over Development of Personnel and principals over Managing the School.

Hypothesis No. 2 is supported since there were significant relationships between teachers' allocation of decision scores and teachers' views of the dimensions of

TABLE 11

Correlations between Teachers' Self-Assigned Decision Scores and Teachers' OCDQ Scores

Functional Areas	Dimensions of Organizational Climate							
	D	H	E	I	A	P	T	C
Decision Scores	Teachers' OCDQ Scores							
1. Educational Program....	.33	.22	.03	.24	-.09	.02	-.23	.15
2. Development of Personnel	.33	.26	.05	.15	.02	.07	-.16	.34
3. Managing the School....	.16	-.10	-.01	-.16	-.29	.04	-.08	-.02
4. Community Relations....	.05	-.17	.09	.06	.25	.22	.19	.18
5. Total.....	.32	.14	.04	.15	-.08	.08	-.17	.20

D - Disengagement
H - Hindrance
E - Esprit
I - Intimacy
A - Aloofness
P - Production Emphasis
T - Thrust
C - Consideration

Note: Correlations below .30 are not significant; those between .30 and .39 are significant at the 5 percent level; those over .39 are significant at the 1 percent level.

TABLE 12

Correlations between Teachers' Decision Scores assigned to Principals and Teachers' OCDQ Scores

Functional Areas	Dimensions of Organizational Climate							
	D	H	E	I	A	P	T	C
Decision Scores	Teachers' OCDQ Scores							
1. Educational Program.....	.04	.08	.13	.01	-.17	.13	.01	.11
2. Development of Personnel	.11	-.13	.37	.25	-.53	.01	.08	.24
3. Managing the School.....	-.05	.20	-.02	-.16	.23	.21	.11	.21
4. Community Relations.....	.06	-.01	-.02	-.05	-.11	.09	.04	.11
5. Total.....	.06	.06	.18	.02	-.22	.17	.09	.26

D - Disengagement
H - Hindrance
E - Esprit
I - Intimacy
A - Aloofness
P - Production Emphasis
T - Thrust
C - Consideration

Note: Correlations under .30 are not significant; those between .30 and .39 are significant at the 5 percent level; those over .39 are significant at the 1 percent level.

TABLE 13

Canonical Analysis: Teacher OCDQ vs.
Teacher Decision Allocation

Canonical Function I (χ^2 = 33.05, df = 15, p = .0054)
canonical r = .82

OCDQ	Correlations with Canonical Variable		Decision Allocation	
Disengagement	.32	.40	Ed. Prog.	To Teachers
Hindrance	.09	.39	Dev. Pers.	
Esprit	.30	.38	Man. Sch.	
Intimacy	.26	-.26	Comm. Rel.	
Aloofness	-.75	.32	Ed. Prog.	To Principals
Prod. Emphasis	-.12	.77	Dev. Pers.	
Thrust	-.21	-.14	Man. Sch.	
Consideration	.21	.15	Comm. Rel.	

Canonical Function II (χ^2 = 24.03, df = 13, p = .0320)
canonical r = .75

Disengagement	.24	.27	Ed. Prog.	To Teachers
Hindrance	.58	.55	Dev. Pers.	
Esprit	-.03	-.33	Man. Sch.	
Intimacy	.12	.00	Comm. Rel.	
Aloofness	.47	.13	Ed. Prog.	To Principals
Prod. Emphasis	.23	-.10	Dev. Pers.	
Thrust	-.09	.57	Man. Sch.	
Consideration	.53	.07	Comm. Rel.	

organizational climate of their schools. It must be admitted that the small number of significant relationships came as a surprise. It was assumed that teachers as professionals would reveal a more extensive pattern of consistent relationships between their perceived decision domain and organizational climate. The fact that the canonical analysis did not indicate central involvement of the Educational Program dimension in either composite dimension is especially surprising.

Concluding Observations

When this study was planned, control structure in school systems was defined as the organization for decision-making. Decision-making may be centralized or decentralized. When it is decentralized it may be said to be diffuse, allocating considerable amounts of decision-making to persons in lower positions in the chain of command. Thus, elementary school principals and teachers would have a large decision domain in a decentralized or diffuse decision-making structure. It was assumed that teachers and principals were professionals and would enjoy a high degree of autonomy in their work. If they felt that they had a large decision domain they would rate organizational climate

of schools as high in esprit, thrust, and consideration, low in disengagement, hindrance, and aloofness, and average in intimacy and production emphasis as a general pattern with variations under selected circumstances.

The canonical analysis made it possible to relate principals' OCDQ scores conjointly with their allocation of decision scores to themselves and to their teachers. In other words, the principals' perception of the total decision picture in their schools was related to their OCDQ scores. This produced two independent composite dimensions as stated earlier. The correlations shown in Tables 8 and 9 reveal specifically that principals with high self-assigned decision scores view organizational climate as high in aloofness, production emphasis, and thrust in the Educational Program area and high in esprit, production emphasis, and thrust in Community Relations (Table 8). Principals who assigned teachers high decision scores viewed organizational climate as low in aloofness, production emphasis, thrust, and consideration in the Educational Program and low in aloofness and thrust in the Development of Personnel (Table 9).

The second canonical functional relationship between principals' views of climate and decision allocation is clearly principal-oriented at the expense of teachers. Especially noteworthy here is the fact that principal control of decision making is associated with high scores on all of the principal-oriented (last 4) scales of the OCDQ. In psychological terms, it appears that narcissism is a concommitant of dominating behavior.

The first canonical functional relationship specifies a more precisely-defined association between a principal's concern with community relations and personnel development on the one hand and his view of his school's morale and his teachers' freedom to pursue their professional duties on the other. If value-loaded terms are permissable, this second functional relationship is the "good" pattern -- the more enlightened or person-oriented. In contrast, the first canonical relationship seems to reflect the classic paternalistic authoritarian pattern, with a rather interesting minor theme which suggests the notion that teachers are primarily interested in their own social group.

The canonical relationships isolated in the analysis of teacher data rather precisely describe two

quite different aspects of the teachers' views of school climate and decision making. The first pattern is one in which the principal focuses on personnel development, and his relationships with teachers are quite informal and personalized. The second pattern has the teachers involved in personnel matters while the principal focuses on managing the school. The climate is marked by preponderant routine and rules, although the principal attempts to consider the teachers' individual needs.

It must be noted here that while the analyses of principals' scores were derived from 38 individuals, the teachers' analyses represent consistencies among the test behaviors of 38 groups of individuals. For this reason alone, one might expect a generally lower order of association between the climate dimensions and those concerning decision allocation when we turn from principals to teachers. Even so, two significant canonical relationships emerged in each analysis.

The emergent climate-decision patterns are far from equivalent in the two analyses, but without much imagination one can recognize in each the echo of the other. Principals pattern I and teachers pattern I both reflect a principals' concern with personnel

development, while both of the second canonical functions suggest a more formalistic authoritarian framework for principal-teacher relationships. The fact that these two patterns seem to be present in both analyses, yet with strikingly different specific characteristics, reinforces the general conclusion that principals and teachers simply do not use a common frame of reference for viewing their relationships to each other; they see decision making and school climate from quite dissimilar vantage points.

Probably the most striking <u>contrast</u> between the climate-decision analysis of principals and that of teachers is the absence of any clear relationship between teachers evaluation of climate and their view of their own general autonomy. For principals such a general relationship appears quite blatantly in the second canonical pattern. This is certainly not true for the teachers' analysis where neither canonical pattern can be construed as a general teacher-power dimension. What emerges instead is a definite <u>split</u> of functions between teachers and principals -- personnel development to the teachers and school management to the principals.

The most interesting and puzzling aspect of the data concerns the lack of any strong relationships between teachers autonomy in the Educational Program area and their view of the school climate. If teachers are true professionals, this would seem to be a crucial aspect of the relationship between climate estimates and decision-making power. There must be some unrecognized factor here. Perhaps the unrecognized item is the nature of the teachers' professional domain. Stinch-Combe compared bureaucratic practices in mass production and construction industries.[8] Administration in the construction industry depends upon a highly professionalized manual labor force. Contracts contain specifications of the goals of work and prices and are usually accompanied by blueprints; they do not contain actual directives of work; the latter does not have to be there because they were already incorporated in the professionalized culture of the workers. Is there a parallel here between the role of the teacher and the role of the carpenter or electrician or plumber? In a school system the control structure may be comparable to the contractual arrangements and blueprints in the construction industry and

the classroom teacher is expected to manifest professional competence comparable to the construction worker. Whatever decisions and policies are made by the administrative hierarchy are known to the teacher; the teacher then proceeds with his work and judges his own professional autonomy within the contractual framework. Decision points above the teacher's position in the hierarchy have little bearing upon the teacher's perceptions of the work situation unless the teacher's welfare (salary, tenure, etc.) are involved. It is likely that the Vignette Instrument used in this study was overweighted with items which could just as well be decided by someone superordinate to the teacher without altering the teacher's perceptions of organizational climate. The notions projected above seem to fall in line with Peabody's[7] findings which highlight the importance attached to authority of professional competence in the elementary school.

The notion that the teacher's decision domain may be comparable to that of the construction worker has some support from Lortie's[5] analysis of the teacher and the authority system. All of the schools included in the present study operated under

an organization for instruction known as the self-contained classroom. Lortie hypothesized that the authority teachers possess stems from the spatial work arrangements found in most school and from the informal rules that are connected with those work arrangements. The self-contained classroom organization is more than a physical reality; it is also a social system in which the teacher is separated from immediate supervision, protected against intrustion by others while teaching, and is considered and treated as an equal by others. Lortie called this "the autonomy-equality pattern." It may be that this pattern has more to do with the teacher's perception of organizational climate than the decision domain tapped in the present study. One must recognize a conflict, however, between Lortie's statement of the source of the teacher's authority under the technically competent employee concept. Lortie stated that the type of authority teachers possess under the autonomy-equality pattern is not the kind we associate with the prestige term <u>professional</u>.

Bibliography

1. Blau, Peter M., and Scott, W. Richard, Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962.

2. Fogarty, Bryce M., and Gregg, Russell T., "Centralization of Decision Making and Selected Characteristics of Superintendents of Schools." Educational Administration Quarterly, 2:62-72. Winter 1966.

3. Halpin, Andrew W., and Croft, Don B., The Organizational Climate of Schools. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, The University of Chicago, 1963.

4. Kimbrough, Ralph B., Political Power and Educational Decision-Making. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1964, Chap. 12, "Decision-Making in Individual Schools."

5. Lortie, Dan C., "The Teacher and Team Teaching: Suggestions for Long-Range Research." Chap. 9 in Judson T. Shaplin and Henry F. Olds, Jr., editors, Team Teaching. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

6. McLeod, Mack E., Domain for Decisions: A Study of Organizational Structure through Development and Allocation of Problems for Decision. Austin, Texas: Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Texas, 1965.

7. Peabody, Robert L., "Perceptions of Organizational Analysis." Administrative Science Quarterly, 6:463-82, March 1962.

8. Stinchcombe, Arthur L., "Bureaucratic and Craft Administration of Production: A Comparative Study." Administrative Science Quarterly, 4:168-87. Sept. 1959.

Appendix A. Analysis of Variance Design

Twenty-eight dependent variables were analyzed by use of the design described below. These variables were the 8 OCDQ scales, 4 decision area-scores and their total for Principal as object (5 scores), and for Teacher as object (5 scores), and 4 influence area-scores and their total for Principal as object (5 scores), and for Teacher as object (5 scores).

The two-way analysis of variance design simultaneously answers the following questions about a given dependent variable:

Do reliable (statistically significant) differences exist

(a) between the average scores given by the 38 principals and the average of the mean-scores from the 38 corresponding groups of teachers? (This is the "sources" effect.)

(b) among the average scores of all teachers and principals in the 6 school systems represented by the 38 schools? (This is the "systems" effect.)

(c) among the school systems, with regard to principal-teacher differences? (This is the "interaction" effect.)

The analysis of variance design is a between-within design, sometimes called a subject-groups (system) by treatments (principal vs. teacher-mean) design, and is diagrammed below.

School System	Principals' Data	Teachers' Data
A (5 schools)	5 scores	5 means
B (11 schools)	11 scores	11 means
C (4 schools)	4 scores	4 means
D (6 schools)	6 scores	6 means
E (6 schools)	6 scores	6 means
F (6 schools)	6 scores	6 means
Total = 38 schools		

The teacher data ("treatment" two) were entered into the design as 38 single numbers which were the means of the teachers in the 38 schools concerned. Thus the breakdown of the total of 75 available degrees of freedom was:

	df
Between Schools	37
Systems	5
Error (B)	32

Within Schools	38	
Sources (principal-teachers)		1
Interaction (systems by sources)		5
Error (W)		32

F-ratios were computed for Systems (using error B), and for Sources and Interaction (using error W). From these F-ratios exact probabilities were computed for the chance occurrence of the observed differences for each effect.

VIGNETTE INSTRUMENT II

The Vignette Instrument attached hereto contains a brief description of 80 problem situations similar to those found in the operation of the elementary schools of your school district. Consider each problem as a representative sample of a number of problems similar to it.

1. Approval of the suggested listof units to be taught in 4th grade social studies for the school district.
2. Approve Mr. Stokes daily teaching schedule.
3. Determine the content of the eight hallway bulletin boards in Hillcrest School which teachers take care of.
4. Select the films to be used by Mrs. Sloan for her 3rd grade Indian unit.
5. That Hillcrest School wil dismiss formal classes today at 1:30 for a "field day" in which only Hillcrest students compete in track and field activities under the supervision of the Hillcrest teachers.
6. That Miss Stokes, a 2nd grade teacher at Hillcrest, will be excused at 2:45 today in order to make a dental appointment.
7. The number of reading groups in Miss Jones' 3rd grade class at Hillcrest.
8. The reading group in which Jane Carson should be placed in Miss Henson's 1st grade room at Hillcrest.
9. That Jimmy Kone, a new student to Hillcrest School, will be placed in Mrs. Jenning's 4th grade class.
10. That Johnny Holmes will receive "D" in arithmetic this 6-weeks reporting period.
11. That Bonny Martinez, in Miss Harper's first grade class, is to be retained next year in first grade.
12. That no student is to be retained more than two years in elementary school.
13. Determine the person to administer make-up tests at Hillcrest to children absent during the regular achievement testing time.
14. That achievement test results are to be reported to the Central office of the school district.
15. From the approved list, what workbook will be used by Mrs. Hager's 4th grade arithmetic class.
16. Determine that Mrs. Stokes' 5th grade class should finish their reading workbook by April 15th.
17. If students may be used as aids in the library.
18. Which students will be selected as aides.

19. Select books and materials for the library according to established criteria.

20. Selection of damaged books to be sent to the bindery for repair.

21. To offer Miss Stokes a teaching contract with intentions of assigning her to a 5th grade at Hillcrest School.

22. To assign Miss Stokes, a newly hired teacher, to Hillcrest School.

23. To transfer Mr. Sloan from a 5th grade assignment at Jefferson School to a 6th grade assignment at Hillcrest School.

24. To transfer Miss Brown from a 2nd grade assignment in Hillcrest to a 1st grade assignment in Hillcrest Schools.

25. To assign Mrs. James a combination of 2nd and 3rd grades in Hillcrest School.

26. To determine the total number of teachers to be assigned to Hillcrest School.

27. To designate teachers responsible for these extra-curricular duties: safety patrol, supervise P. E. equipment, before school and after school "grounds" duty.

28. To select Hillcrest School representatives to Professional organizations such as: ACEI, Faculty Club, Classroom teachers.

29. The assignment of teachers to classrooms in Hillcrest School.

30. To set the number of days that Hillcrest teachers shall attend the district wide inservice program in August.

31. Select and hire a person as librarian at Hillcrest school.

32. That Miss Wentworth should be given some assistance in controlling the rowdy behavior of her 5th grade class.

33. To plan a remedial reading program for a slow learning group in Miss Jones' 5th grade classroom.

34. To determine what unit Mr. Stokes will teach next in his 6th grade social studies class.

35. That a formal evaluation of teachers shall be made yearly and the information placed in the teachers' personnel folders.

36. That Mrs. Hallmark must receive six additional hours credit in Elementary Education by Sept. 1 if she is to retain her teaching position.

37. To call a special faculty meeting for Hillcrest School.

38. If Mrs. Johns should stay for the faculty meeting as she is recuperating from the flu and is in a generally "run-down" condition.

39. To "call-off" a faculty meeting as there is a Halloween carnival at Hillcrest School the same day beginning at 6:30 p.m.

40. To approve a request by the Director of Elementary Education to speak briefly at the faculty meeting.

41. Where textbooks not in use shall be stored in Hillcrest School.

42. Who shall have access to the bookroom.

43. When books may be taken from the bookroom.

44. To issue Jim Smith, a 5th grade student, a particular supplementary reader.

45. The percentage of membership on which the allotted number of supplementary readers is based.

46. If Mrs. Smith should go to the bookroom and get a set of basal readers for a group of her second graders who have completed the first set.

47. That four custodians will be assigned to Hillcrest School.

48. That Mr. Jones, a custodian at Hillcrest, will be responsible for all rooms on the north wing.

49. That two temporary buildings should be moved to the Hillcrest School campus.

50. That the grass on the front lawn at Hillcrest is to be watered this morning.

51. Select and hire a replacement worker for the cafeteria kitchen.

52. Assign custodians to cafeteria duties at Hillcrest.

53. That the Hillcrest lunchroom may be decorated for a 6th grade social on Friday night.

54. To allot the teaching supply funds to the Hillcrest teachers.

55. Final approval of items requested by teachers for purchase (teaching supplies).

56. To keep records (make entries, get totals, balances, etc.) of the funds of Hillcrest School.

57. To issue to Mrs. Smith, a 1st grade teacher, some paste and newsprint paper.

58. To do the figuring of the six weeks attendance report of Hillcrest School to be sent to the Central office.

59. To make out a bank deposit slip for the money collected from children the first day of school.

60. To count the money collected from the pencil machine at Hillcrest School.

61. Approve use after school of the Hillcrest school playground for "little league" practice.

62. To have the Hillcrest school east boundary moved two blocks west for next year to relieve crowded conditions.

63. To approve the transfer of Mike Sloan, a 4th grade student from another elementary school zone in the districtto Hillcrest because his mother works nearby.

64. File charges in a Justice of the Peace Court against a parent in a chronic truancy case

65. Select the songs to be sung at P.T.A. meeting by the upper grades choir.

66. Whether or not tickets for the Shrine Circus may be sold in the office at Hillcrest School.

67. A Baptist Church group would like to use the Hillcrest cafetorium as a temporary meeting place Sunday mornings for about three months.

68. Determine if Jimmy Comander should be given a certificate to receive a pair of shoes from the Salvation Army.

69. To set the date for the P.T.A. "back-to'school" night meeting at Hillcrest.

70. To approve participation of the school band in a Sunday afternoon city-wide music festival at City Auditorium.

71. That the school day will be extended 15 minutes throughout the district.

72. That Hillcrest school will dismiss at 2:30 today so that parents who so desire may take their children to the "Frontier Day" parade, an elaborate all-city affair which begins at 3:00.

73. That the report card symbos for primary grades in Hillcrest school shall be "E, S, N, and U."

74. That report cards will be sent out every six weeks at Hillcrest.

75. That Anita Bohmer will be given a make-up test over the 6th grade science unit. She was absent 3 days prior to the test and did poorly, getting a "C" on her report card. Her mother made the request to the principal.

76. That children who will be six years old by Nov. 1 will be admitted to 1st grade at Hillcrest School.

77. That "graduation exercises" will be held at night near the end of the year at Hillcrest School.

78. That the new wing to be constructed at Hillcrest School will be air-conditioned.

79. Call Mrs. Jones, a mother, about her son's cafeteria debt of $1.05.

80. Set the macimum amount of money that may be collected from any child for shcool supplie

Please fill in this personal information.

1. Your city_____Your School_____Date_____
2. Your present position (grade or subjects)_____
3. Years of teaching experience (including this year)_____Marital status_____
4. College work completed: Less than Bachelor's ___Bachelor's___Master's____Doctor's_____

VIGNETTE RESPONSE SHEET

Directions: You are asked to make two responses to each item in the Vignette Instrument. This is how you are to proceed:

1. Read the item carefully. Then turn to this response sheet. Place an X in the box under the name of the person who makes the final decision regarding this problem.
2. Place a value of 1 to 5 under the name or names of persons who influence the decision: if you (or any of the teachers) make the decision yourself without being influenced by any one else, you place a 5 in the box under teacher. If the superintendent makes the decision but he is influenced strongly by what the principal says and to a minor degree by the views of the business manager, you would place a 1 in the box under business manager, a 1 in the box under superintendent and a 3 in the box under the principal. The total points you allocate can never exceed 5, but they may be distributed among as many as five different persons. See example (Ex.), top line.

Vignette Number	Teacher(s)	Principal(s)	Curr.Dir(s)	Suprvsr(s)	Bus. Mgr.	Supt.	School Board
Ex.		3			1	X 1	
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							

Vignette Number	Teacher(s)	Principal(s)	Curr.Dir(s)	Suprvsr(s)	Bus.Mgr.	Supt.	School Board
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							
35							
36							
37							
38							
39							
40							
41							
42							
43							
44							
45							
46							
47							

Vignette Number	Teacher(s)	Principal(s)	Curr.Dir(s)	Suprvsr(s)	Bus.Mgr.	Supt.	School Board
48							
49							
50							
51							
52							
53							
54							
55							
56							
57							
58							
59							
60							
61							
62							
63							
64							
65							
66							
67							
68							
69							
70							
71							
72							
73							
74							
75							
76							
77							

Vignette Number	Teacher(s)	Principal(s)	Curr.Dir(s)	Suprvsr(s)	Bus.Mgr.	Supt.	School Board
78							
79							
80							